clearly condemned by the International Labor Organization, United Nations Human Rights Commission, Amnesty International, and our own Department of State.

Columbia can drastically reduce the violence against trade unionists. It begins with effectively halting the impunity enjoyed by these perpetrators, many of which have credible ties to the military and police. Columbia must aggressively prosecute these criminals and restore its people's confidence in justice.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution fall short in condemning the impunity enjoyed by human rights violators and the violence perpetrated against all levels of society, including organized labor. Many of my fellow Members have actively engaged the Columbian Government with these concerns but without success. Passing a resolution basically congratulating Columbia on improving its human rights record is wrong and counterproductive.

It is my hope that Columbia will choose to aggressively improve it's human rights record, so in the future we may pass a similar resolution, with unanimous consent.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House International Relations Committee and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I would like to state my strong objections to the manner in which this piece of legislation was raised. I was only made aware of the existence of this legislation this morning, just a couple of hours before I was expected to vote on it. There was no committee markup of the legislation, nor was there any notice that this legislation would appear on today's suspension calendar.

This legislation represents a very serious and significant shift in United States policy toward Colombia. It sets us on a slippery slope toward unwise military intervention in a foreign civil war that has nothing to do with the United States.

Our policy toward Colombia was already ill-advised when it consisted of an expensive front in our failed ''war on drugs.'' Plan Colombia, launched nearly 2 years ago, sent $1.3 billion to Colombia under the guise of this war on drugs. A majority of that went to the Colombian military; much was no doubt lost through corruption. Though this massive assistance program was supposed to put an end to the FARC and other rebel groups involved in drug trafficking, 2 years later we are now being told—in this legislation and elsewhere—that the FARC and rebel groups are stronger than ever. So now we are being asked to provide even more assistance in an effort that seems to have had a result the opposite of what was intended. In effect, we are being asked to redouble failed efforts. That doesn't make sense.

At the time Plan Colombia was introduced, President Clinton promised the American people that this action would in no way drag us into the Colombian civil war. This current legislation takes a bad policy and makes it much worse. This legislation calls for the United States ''to assist the Government of Colombia protect its democracy from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations . . . '' In other words, this legislation elevates a civil war in Colombia to the level of the international war on terror, and it will drag us deep into the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, there is a world of difference between a rebel group fighting a civil war in a foreign country and the kind of international terrorist organization that targeted the United States last September. As ruthless and violent as the three rebel groups in Colombia no doubt are, their struggle for power in that country is an internal one. None of the three appears to have any intention of carrying out terrorist activities in the United States. Should we become involved in a civil war against them, however, these organizations may well begin to view the United States as a legitimate target. What possible reason could there be for us to take on such a deadly risk? What possible rewards could there be for the United States support for one faction or the other in this civil war?

As with much of our interventionism, if you scratch the surface of the high-sounding calls to ''protect democracy'' and ''stop drug trafficking'' you often find commercial interests driving U.S. foreign policy. This also appears to be the case in Colombia. And like Afghanistan, Kosovo, Iraq, and elsewhere, that commercial interest appears to be related to oil The U.S. administration request for FY 2003 includes a request for an additional $98 million to help protect the Cano-Limon Pipeline—jointly owned by the Colombian Government and Occidental Petroleum. Rebels have been blowing up parts of the pipeline and the resulting disruption of the flow of oil is costing Occidental Petroleum and the Colombian Government more than half a billion dollars per year. Now the administration wants the American taxpayer to finance the equipping and training of a security force to protect the pipeline, which much of the training coming from the U.S. military. Since when is it the responsibility of the American citizen to subsidize risky investments made by private companies in foreign countries? And since when is it the duty of American service men and women to lay their lives on the line for these commercial interests?

Further intervention in the internal political and military affairs of Colombia will only increase the mistrust and anger of the average Colombian citizen toward the United States, as these citizens will face the prospect of an ongoing, United States-supported war in their country. Already Plan Colombia has fueled the deep resentment of Colombian farmers toward the United States. These farmers have seen their legitimate crops destroyed, water supply polluted, and families sprayed as powerful herbicides miss their intended marks. An escalation of American involvement will only make matters worse.

Mr. Speaker, at this critical time, our precious military and financial resources must not be diverted to a conflict that has nothing to do with the United States and poses no threat to the United States. Trying to designate increased military involvement in Colombia as a new front on the ''war on terror'' makes no sense at all. It will only draw the United States into a quagmire much like Vietnam. The Colombian civil war is now in its fourth decade; pretending that the fighting there is somehow related to our international war on terrorism is to stretch the imagination to the breaking point. It is unwise and dangerous.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the people of Colombia and ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

The people of Colombia have suffered through years of violence, deprivation, and discord. They have seen their country torn apart in a violent war between their government and various rebel factions.

Despite the best efforts of President Pastrana, the murder and kidnapping of Colombian citizens, government officials, and even American visitors have increased. His efforts to reach a peaceful settlement have been rejected by the rebel groups.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has made a commitment to addressing the root cause of these problems in Colombia—the drug trade. Through Plan Colombia we are working with our Andean allies to destroy drug production and interrupt drug traffic.

Our assistance will help Colombia's Government lead the country and, eventually, end drug production and stabilize the Andean region.

As Colombia continues working to secure lasting peace, the United States should continue to offer support and assistance.

This resolution is an important expression of that support, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.Res. 358.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT ON ITS BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 32.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 32, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie	Bartlett	Bono
Ackerman	Barton	Boozman
Aderholt	Bass	Borski
Akin	Becerra	Boswell
Allen	Bereuter	Boucher
Andrews	Berkley	Boyd
Armey	Berman	Brady (PA)
Baca	Berry	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Biggert	Brown (FL)
Baird	Bilirakis	Brown (OH)
Baker	Bishop	Brown (SC)
Baldacci	Blumenauer	Bryant
Baldwin	Blunt	Burr
Ballenger	Boehlert	Burton
Barcia	Boehner	Buyer
Barr	Bonilla	Callahan
Barrett	Bonior	Camp

Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Conyers

NOT VOTING—26

Bentsen
Blagojevich
Calvert
Condit
Cubin
Dooley
Doolittle
Filner
Hyde
Kilpatrick
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Jeff
Napolitano
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez
Sanders
Solis
Traficant
Waters
Watson (CA)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey

□ 1450

Mr. TERRY and Mr. CROWLEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 50 on congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 50, I was conducting official business in my San Diego, California district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to business in the District, I respectfully request a leave of absence from legislative business scheduled for today, Wednesday, March 6. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 48 on approving the Journal; ''no'' on rollcall No. 49, the motion to proceed to the previous question during the consideration of H. Con. Res. 275; and ''aye'' on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S.J. Res. 32.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was attending important business in my Congressional District on March 6th, which included activities relating to the Primary election in California.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 48, ''no'' on rollcall No. 49, and ''yea'' on rollcall No. 50.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GANSKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CEASEFIRE BETWEEN THE SRI LANKAN GOVERNMENT AND THE LTTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to bring to the attention of my colleagues a historic peace initiative between the Sri Lankan Government and the LTTE.

On February 22, 2002, the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, the Honorable Wickremesinghe, and the leader of the LTTE, Mr. Prabhakaran, signed an agreement that established a long-term cease fire by both sides that signifies the beginning of peace talks and, simply, a new era of peace for war-torn Sri Lanka.

For nearly 2 decades now, there has been a civil war taking place between the Government of Sri Lanka and the LTTE, one of the world's most dangerous guerilla groups. The cease fire was negotiated by Norway and will be overseen by Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark.

I am optimistic about this movement towards peace and feel the United States should extend its support for this agreement to end years of violent blood shed. Indeed, the LTTE will have to show great will to bring an end to its violent attacks that have claimed tens of thousands of innocent lives. However, the current global situation has provided a glimpse of hope that this cease fire will be a successful endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, since the September 11 attacks, there has been a desire throughout the world to move away from senseless violence; and clearly, we began a new campaign against terrorism. This new atmosphere may potentially foster improved relations between Sri Lanka and the LTTE. Additionally, the LTTE may have been more apt to agree to this peace agreement since their popularity and their financial support was waning through countries that formerly favored them or provided support.